Bertrand Russell on the U.S. War in Vietnam, P. 3

How the New Leader Got $3,000 From Chiang Kai-Shek's Press Agents, Page 2

The Inescapable Loneliness of the Black Man's Life in America

"An African Ambassador who had experienced several times refusals of service in restaurants finally complained to the Department of State when his wife and 8-year old child were denied a glass of water. The Ambassador wrote to me that he had been an officer in the French Army during World War II and had led his men into battle. He said that even under battle conditions he had treated the children of the enemy with enough kindness and consideration to spare them a drink of water from his canteen. . . .

"A counsellor of an African embassy: 'The result is that a black diplomat is rather cut off, he withdraws to himself and sees only his own people. This creates constant resentment in our staff. Some of us are rather bitter. There is so much about America which is good. What America has done for the underdeveloped countries is wonderful. But here, in this matter, we are dealing on a personal level. When people come to our country, we try to make them feel more at home than in their country. Our general feeling here is 'I am forever a stranger.'"

—Secretary of State Rusk on Civil Rights, July 10.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XI, NO. 16 JULY 22, 1963 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

In the Name of Marx as Once in the Name of Jesus

The end of the Sino-Soviet conference and the happy beginning of the Khrushchev-Harriman talks has distracted attention from another momentous meeting in Moscow. The mission from Peking and the mission from Washington overshadowed a mission from the Vatican, the arrival of two papal envoys to attend the golden jubilee of the Patriarch Alexis, "the first time," the Associated Press reported, "that the Vatican has assigned clergymen to attend a major ceremony of the Russian Church since the great schism of 1054" which occurred after "Catholic missionaries in Russia were imprisoned and murdered." Nine centuries ago the East-West split was between Rome and Moscow; the bitterness was between Christians, as we see it now between Marxist-Leninists; the doctrinal differences between the Eastern and Western Churches were as subtly hair-splitting and as difficult for the innocent heathen to understand as is the doctrinal dispute between the Muscovite and the Chinese Marxists. Blood was shed in the name of Jesus, as it may some day be shed in the name of Marx; in both cases, behind the dogma the sophisticated will scent the clash of rival bureaucracies, then of priests, now of commissars, seeking to consolidate and extend their power in mutual fear and suspicion. It is not by enlistment in such ancient forms of power struggle that intellectuals can help mankind find its way to safety in the thermonuclear age.

Mao Defied Stalin and Ignored Lenin

Power and not dogma is at stake. For Mao to rehabilitate Stalin is nonsense; if Mao had obeyed Stalin, Chiang would still be in power. For Stalin like Khrushchev put Russian state interests ahead of revolution elsewhere. Equally nonsensical is Mao's claim to be the more perfect Leninist. Under Lenin revolutionary workers seized power in the cities, and then worker armies fastened their power on the countryside. Under Mao revolutionary peasants seized power in the countryside and then peasant armies captured the cities. In both countries a monolithic hierarchic party ruled from above wields power; in both the dictatorship of the proletariat is a myth. The "cult of personality" is one of the topics in dispute between them but in one country there is a cult of Khrushchev and in the other a cult of Mao. In 1956 Mao was the "liberal" and Khrushchev was saying Stalin-style that the Hungarian revolt might have been avoided "if a couple of writers had been shot in time." Then Mao in inviting a "hundred flowers to contend" seemed to be wedding John Stuart Mill to Karl Marx—until the experiment showed such wide resentment in China against power-corrupted Communists and stultifying thought controls, that the lid had to be clamped on again. The two rivals feel for each other's weak points. Mao's aborted "great leap forward" and largely abandoned Communes threaten his internal prestige, as does the failure of Khrushchev's efforts peacefully to solidify the East German regime. Mao and Khrushchev, like Pope and Patriarch almost a thousand years ago, move toward schism. Like warring Christians before them, warring Marxist-Leninists would sooner co-exist with the heathen than with each other. While Moscow reaches Westward for agreement, so does Peking; the Chinese have been trying for months to replace Soviet ties with new trade arrangements in London, Ottawa and Paris.

The growing split between Moscow and Peking has its good and its bad side. The good side is that with the split, as with the split that brought Protestantism to birth, the existence of rival power centers and rival dogmas in the Com-

(Continued on Page Four)

Reminder to Leftist Super-Dupers

"The main thing, don't you see, is to put an end to imperialism as quickly as possible; but how—with what losses—this will be achieved seems a secondary question. To whom, it is right to ask, is it secondary? To the hundreds of millions of people who are doomed to death in the event of the unleashing of a thermonuclear war? To the states that will be erased from the face of the earth in the very first hours of such a war?" *—From Moscow's July 14 letter to Peking.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fulbright Sheds New Light on the Links Between Formosa and Madison Avenue

How the New Leader Got $3,000 From Chiang Kai-shek's Press Agents

The CHAIRMAN (Sen. Fulbright): On page 3 of the annex [to the public relations agreement between the Hamilton Wright Organization and the Chiang Kai-shek government] the last paragraph reads as follows—

"Assist in arrangements to publish an article entitled 'China, the U.S. and the Continuing Struggle' in the New Leader magazine and to publish and distribute copies of said article to representative citizens, writers and leaders in the United States." Do you recall that?

Mr. Hamilton WRIGHT, Sr.: Vaguely.

The CHAIRMAN: How did you fulfill this agreement?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: I got bamboozled on this one. The New Leader came to me and hit me up for a little money that this would be a great thing to have and I fell for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Was this article favorable to Free China?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you pay the New Leader to publish it?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Not the full amount, no.

The CHAIRMAN: How much did you pay?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: I don't remember.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you pay them $3,000?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: It could be, if that is what the sum is.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you report to the Department of Justice that you paid the New Leader?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN: I don't believe you did. We couldn't find it.

The CHAIRMAN: Tell me, have you paid other magazines in similar fashion for printing articles of this kind?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN: Are subsidies for articles commonly practiced in public relations?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: What is that again, are what?

The CHAIRMAN: Are subsidies—?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Only subsidies in the case of perhaps travel expenses, things like that. I think that is quite common in the industry.

The CHAIRMAN: The direct payment of a magazine to publish it is not common?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Not in our business at all.

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: We have never done this, outside of this one thing that I can remember.

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: That is the exception.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all you can think of?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.:There may be one or two others.

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Do you know of any? I don't know of any, either.

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: We operate on the theory that our material, if it is not interesting enough to justify publication by a legitimate magazine, it has no business being published.

The CHAIRMAN: This was interesting enough, wasn't it?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: You mean the New Leader article?

The CHAIRMAN: Did you have to pay the $3,000 because it wasn't interesting enough?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: No, Mr. Chairman, I have got to say that if I was as well informed then as I am today, I would never have done that. I was approached by the editor, and was really led down the road that this would be a great thing and would enhance my standing with the Chinese and the rest. . . .

Senator AIKEN: You say it [the New Leader] is highly intellectual?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Supposedly.

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: This comes under the category of probably a dozen magazines that live by the seat of their pants, and exist strictly on contributions from different people to publish stories that certain groups consider very favorable to their interests. They have no circulation, they have no standing, they have no prestige at all, and I personally never pay any attention to them personally at all. . . .

The CHAIRMAN: You say in this same "New Plans for 1959" cooperation with "anti-Communist groups"—

"This year we will give fullest cooperation to groups such as 'The Committee of One Million'—as you know we have already agreed to assist the magazine New Leader with a contribution of $3,000 to enable them to publish Richard Walker's sensational anti-Communist story, 'China, the U.S. and the Continuing Struggle.'"

The CHAIRMAN: But here again in all these cases the fact that this material was prepared by an agent of a foreign government does not appear, is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: Just a minute. I am thinking back on this. And I don't think anything that was proposed in this statement was done.

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: Except the New Leader. . . .

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: Let me just get into this a little deeper and by way of trying to be helpful and understanding, here is Life Magazine with 13 pages of pictures in color on the art treasures of China.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you pay anybody in Life Magazine to do that?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: Tut, tut, I should say not.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you give them any free trips?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: No, sir; no, sir. Life Magazine, thank God, and there are probably several hundred publications here, you can't touch them with a 20-foot pole.

The CHAIRMAN: Not many of them are as rich as Life.

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: That is right.

Senator AIKEN: Did they pay you?

Mr. WRIGHT, Jr.: No, they didn't.

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: Pardon me, sir, I don't understand it.

Senator AIKEN: I asked did they pay you?

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: No. We sell nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: You are paid by the Government of China.

Mr. WRIGHT, Sr.: We are paid by the Government of China to do this work and whether we are successful or not depends on our ability. We don't always hit a home run every time.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee inquiry into foreign agents executive session, March 25, released July 10.

Senator Douglas Explains

"I find that the Committee of One Million did submit a manuscript to me in June of 1959 opposing the recognition of Communist China. I found myself in general agreement with the sentiments and arguments contained in the article, and after making some changes in it, authorized its distribution over my signature. I was informed that the manuscript had been prepared by the Hamilton Wright organization, but I was not informed that this company was in receipt of any retainer [$300,000 a year] from the Chinese Nationalist Government. I have been very careful to keep myself aloof from the Chinese Nationalist Government and have insisted that the Committee of One Million should not receive any direct or indirect subvention from it. Indeed on March 5, 1959, after an inquiry from my office, Mr. Marvin Liebman, of the Committee of One Million, wrote to my administrative assistant that the '. . . organization has been unique in surviving through the years on the relatively small contributions of public spirited Americans. . . .'"

—Letter from Senator Douglas to Senator Fulbright in the foreign agents investigation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Glance at the World Law We Violate in Vietnam and Cuba

How the U.S. Can Best Advance the Cause of World Peace Through Law

"Peace through law" is a favorite of our State Department. A world conference on the subject, organized by the American Bar Association, has just been held in Athens. Two leading U.S. lawyers have been named to an executive committee which will establish a permanent World Peace Through Law Center. We suggest that the best way to begin this noble crusade is to get our own government to obey the law.

One place would be in South Vietnam. In the letter published below Lord Russell calls attention again to the fact that we are using poisonous chemicals as a weapon of war against the anti-Diem rebels. The Geneva Protocal of 1925 which we signed forbade the use of gas, poison or bacteria in war. Strictly speaking the Protocol does not apply because we never ratified it, though all the other great Powers including the USSR did.

Two U.S. Anti-Poison Weapon Statutes

But our own researches after receiving the Russell letter have turned up two earlier treaties prohibiting the use of "poison or poisoned arms" which *were* ratified by the U.S. and embodied in U.S. law. The 1899 Hague Convention to this effect can be found in 32 U.S. Statutes-at-Large 1803 and the 1909 Hague Convention re-enacting the same provision can be found in 36 Statutes-at-Large 2277. It would be refreshing if we announced that we were going to obey these laws and cease the use of poison as a weapon in Vietnam.

Another law we seem to be violating in South Vietnam is the Geneva Convention of 1949 for the Protection of Civilians in War-Time. It was ratified by the U.S. in 1955. Its terms apply to war "or any other armed conflict," and were intended to prevent the horrors the world saw in the Nazi and Japanese occupations. It forbids "individual or mass forcible transfers," like those of the Diem regime in forcibly evacuating peasants from their villages to "concentration centers."*

A second striking example of our lawlessness is afforded by our relations with Cuba. Our punitive freeze of Cuban bank accounts, like the noose of trade and travel embargoes we tighten around Cuba, are in clear violation of the Charter of the Organization of American States which we signed at Bogota in 1948, and later ratified. Article 15 forbids any form of interference by arms or otherwise in the affairs of another inter-American State and Article 16 forbids any American State to "use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character" against another American State.

Freedom of the seas is a historic principle of world law for which we fought the British in 1812, but now we are doing our best to prevent the Spanish from resuming passenger shipping service to Cuba and threatening action against countries whose ships take supplies to the island. The same can be said of freedom of the air. We are trying to get Mexico, Spain, Canada and Britain to shut off all air travel to Cuba. "Privately," Henry Raymont wrote in the *New York Times* July 12, "U.S. officials acknowledge that several countries feared that to implement a total ban on Cuban air travel would be in violation of the International Civil Aviation Agreement" to which both the U.S. and Cuba are signatories. It seems that to us, as to the German Kaiser when he invaded Belgium in 1914, treaties are but "scraps of paper." This is a poor way to advance the cause of world law.

Sauce Only for The Little Geese

"Geneva, July 10—Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the UN, warned the developing countries today they may be the first to suffer from any violation of the rules and principles of the United Nations."
—Washington Post, July 12.

"United Nations, N.Y., July 10—Britain told the UN Colonialism Committee today that it would not permit a subcommittee to visit British Guiana."
—Same Paper, Same Day, Same Page.

An investigation was voted by the UN Committee into the delay in fulfilling Britain's promise to grant British Guiana independence. It may also throw light on U.S. pressure to delay independence and the part U.S. funds and agents have played in the racial and labor conflicts of the colony.

*** We wish every thoughtful American could read, "The War in Vietnam", by Hugh Deane (Monthly Review Press, 333 6th Ave., NYC 14, 50c), a pamphlet which sets out the whole terrible story with eloquence and painful precision.**

Bertrand Russell on U.S. Use of Poisonous Chemicals in South Vietnam

Dear I. F. Stone:

I am disturbed by the fact that I have not been able to make known to the American public the facts concerning the use of chemicals in Vietnam. When I originally raised this point in my letter to the New York Times, the New York Times attacked me editorially for failing to provide evidence. In my reply to this attack I devoted five paragraphs to specific documentation with regard to the chemicals used. The New York Times published my letter, omitting all the particular references to chemicals, attempting to create the impression that my accusations were without substantiation.

The U.S. Government has been charged by the South Vietnam Liberation Red Cross, after a year's study by them of the chemicals sprayed in South Vietnam and their effect upon the health of human beings, animals and crops, with using weed killers which, in the large doses used, are harmful; with using white arsenic, various kinds of arsenic sodium and arsenite calcium, lead manganese arsenates, D.N.P. and D.N.C. (which inflame and eat into human flesh), and calcic cyanamide (which has caused leaves, flowers and fruits to fall, killed big cattle like buffaloes and cows, and seriously affected thousands of the inhabitants of South Vietnam; with having spread these poisonous chemicals on large and densely populated areas of South Vietnam.

Admittedly, the South Vietnam Liberation Red Cross is, as its name suggests, allied with those opposing the U.S. supported Diem regime, but its published findings cannot be ignored since it has urged international investigation of the situation. The use of these weapons, napalm bombs and chemicals, constitutes and results in atrocities.

I am disturbed that it should be possible for newspapers to behave so brazenly. It is worth pointing out that the editor of the New York Times, in reply to a private protest of mine about this, stated that the reason that my evidence on chemical warfare was not published was because it was known all along to the New York Times!

The New York Times of January 19, 1962, stated that of 2600 villages in Vietnam, nearly 1400 had been destroyed because of military action by the U.S. and the Diem Government. I should be grateful if you would allow me to make these facts known to the American public.

Bertrand Russell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It's Not Progress to Make Peace With Moscow for War on China

(Continued from Page One)

munist camp must end thought control. It is true that Moscow and Peking each has its own system of thought control, as Luther and Calvin had their own in the struggle with the Papacy. But the existence of so many rival "one and only" true interpretations of the Faith became an object lesson in pluralism and opened the door to the right to think for oneself. We may hope for a similar development in the stuffy Communist world. To read the Russian statement is to see how Khrushchev is pushed, for popularity, further along the pathway to destalinization. There is no doubt that Khrushchev has the better side of the argument, both internally and internationally; the Russians want more freedom at home and they want peace abroad. The weakest point ideologically in the Chinese latest blast at Moscow is its attempt to prove the need for a continued hard-line dictatorship. The Chinese contend that dictatorship is required because "class contradictions" still exist. But the classes they specify are hoodlums, idlers and such. These are not classes at all in a Marxist sense, and the excuse recalls Stalin's similar rationalization for terror in the 30's and 40's long after landlord and *bourgeois* had been wiped out. The "class enemies" he killed were often the most devoted of his own party comrades.

Negro and Indian, Malay and Chinese

The bad side of the split is that in a world of growing race tension, the split between Moscow and Peking will seem to millions only another variant of an omnipresent struggle between rich whites (in this case Russians) and underprivileged colored peoples (in this case Chinese). There is evidence that Peking is already exploiting this, and playing on a White Man's Peril to the colored man's revolutionary struggle, as some Americans once spoke, and some Russians may again, of a Yellow Peril. This is a poisonous half truth. It is not by eliminating the white man, whether "imperialist" American or "revisionist" Russian, that the "revolution" can be made secure. The revolution man needs runs deeper than that. The struggle of Negro and Indian in British Guiana; of Negro and Indian in Africa; of Malay and Chinese all over South East Asia; of "brown" India and "yellow" China shows that the worse angels of man's nature do not need a white skin. Internecine hates and tribal rivalries will survive the white race. The Chinese thesis that there can be no peace until "imperialism" is destroyed is only another variant of the familiar "just-one-more-war-to-make-the-world-safe-for-something-or-other." In every major war of history, men have been mobilized by the false hope that just one more big bloody mess and all would be well. Mao comes in where Woodrow Wilson went out, and just in time to have the H-bomb punctuate this folly.

On the international plane, the Sino-Soviet split is not to be welcomed even if it leads to a limited nuclear test ban agreement between Washington and Moscow. Peace between U.S. and U.S.S.R. is not real peace if it merely reflects the beginnings of a bigger struggle between Russia and China. We believe our government should seize the opportunity to make a nuclear test ban agreement, and match Moscow's declaration in its latest blast at Peking that it would never use nuclear weapons first. But if we are wise, we will supplement a Russian agreement with a Chinese agreement on a nuclear free zone for the Pacific *while there is still time.* We are for a reconciliation with Russia *and* a reconciliation with China. To substitute one kind of East-West struggle for another, to move toward an entente with Russia in preparation for an even more cataclysmic future struggle against China is not progress. Reconciliation is mankind's need, and we who drove Peking to extremes by our hateful policies of embargo and isolation, should be the ones to make the first move. It is by magnanimity, and not by missiles, that man's future may be made secure. *July 16*

And How About Genghis Khan?

Senator TALMADGE: Does it not seem to the able Senator from Mississippi that something so far reaching might have been devised by Nero, Macchiavelli or Hitler, instead of by Federal officials at the present time?

Senator STENNIS: It [the President's civil rights bill] is the broadest and most comprehensive language the Senator from Mississippi has ever seen on any subject of this kind. It would grant dictatorial power. Whoever drew the actual language is bound to have had something like this in mind.

—U.S. Senate, July 11.

The Bi-Weekly Is Not Published in August—Next Issue Dated Labor Day Goes to Press August 27

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

7/22/63

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED